REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the careful examination of the application, and for the suggestions for amending claim 10. However, in view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks that follow, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

Amendments:

In view of the fact that the amendments to claim 10 are minor amendments intended to overcome informalities suggested by the Examiner, and do not substantively change the scope of the claim, the Examiner is respectfully requested to enter the amendments to claim 10 after final rejection.

Claim Objections:

As set forth, claim 10 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner.

Art Rejections:

Claims 1-4, 9 and 16-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,113,520, hereinafter *Hirata*.

Hirata discloses a data processor for processing of input data. The processor includes a keyboard 10 that includes a plurality of character keys. The character keys include letter keys as well as function keys 12-19. The processor further includes a RAM 40 which includes a key buffer 41 in which key code data from the keyboard controller 20

are stored, as well as a printing data memory 45 which stores print data of plural text files. According to the disclosure, the processing of key code data input from the keyboard and the printing of data stored in the memory are alternately dispatched by a time slice method under the control of the CPU. See column 1, lines 12-18. Since the key code data must wait while processing is executed for printing, the key code data are temporarily stored in the key buffer 41. See column 1, lines 19-22. According to the summary of the invention, a preference control unit 5 prefers the data processing of the input data in the data processing system 4 to the data delivery processing, when the input at the input device is busy. See column 1, lines 51-54.

The specification further indicates that a print cancel key 19, when depressed, stops printing by the printing device. At the same time, the print data of the text is deleted from the print data memory 45. See column 4, lines 50-55.

Claim 1 defines an image forming apparatus comprising, among other elements, a first memory for storing image data and a second memory for storing image forming conditions. The apparatus further includes a command means for generating a command of discarding the image data being printed from the image output unit and an image data discarding controller for discarding image data stored in the first memory when the command of discarding the image data is generated by the command means, while maintaining the associated image forming conditions stored in the second memory. Thus, it is a feature of claim 1 that the image data is discarded from the first memory while the associated image forming conditions are maintained in the second memory.

In formulating the rejection of claim 1 based on *Hirata*, the Examiner alleges that the key buffer 41 corresponds to the claimed second memory for storing image forming conditions. However, the key buffer 41 records keystrokes from the keyboard. As best as can be determined from the disclosure of *Hirata*, the key code data stored in the key buffer 41 are used for editing the text. See column 2, lines 30-33. See also column 3, lines 56-66. The Examiner refers to column 2, lines 39-44, column 2, lines 65-68 and column 3, lines 36-48. However, none of the sections relied upon by the Examiner indicate that the key buffer 41 is a memory for storing image forming conditions. As best as the disclosure can be understood, the key buffer 41 is used for holding keystrokes that are used for editing the text between printing operations. There is no teaching or suggestion that the key buffer 41 is used to store image forming conditions.

Since *Hirata* does not teach or suggest the second memory for storing image forming conditions, the remaining discussion in the Office Action corresponding *Hirata* to claim 1 is not relevant. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 1 based on *Hirata*. Claims 2-4 and 9 depend from claim 1, and are thus also patentable over *Hirata* at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 16 defines an image forming method that includes, among other things, storing image data in an image memory and storing image forming conditions for the image data in a memory. The claim also includes the step of stopping a print operation of the image data being printed and erasing the image data from the image memory in response to the command, while maintaining the associated image forming conditions in the memory.

As set forth above, *Hirata* does not teach or suggest the concept of a memory for storing image forming conditions. Accordingly, it also does not teach the step of erasing the image data from the image memory in response to a command, while maintaining the associated image forming conditions in the memory.

Accordingly, the rejection of claims 16 and dependent claims 17 and 18 should also be withdrawn.

Claim 19 defines an image forming apparatus that includes a first memory for storing image data and a second memory for storing image forming conditions, wherein an image data discarding controller discards the image data of the job stopped by the stopping controller and maintains the image forming conditions of the job. As set forth above, *Hirata* does not teach or suggest the second memory for storing image forming conditions. Accordingly, it also cannot teach the concept of discarding image data from the first memory while maintaining the image forming conditions in a second memory. Accordingly, claim 19 is also patentable over Hirata.

Claims 6-8 and 10-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hirata* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,152,001, hereinafter *Hanamoto*. Claims 6-8 depend from claim 1. The Examiner appears to be relying on *Hanamoto* for an alleged teaching that the image input unit is an image reader for reading the image from the original and acquiring the image data, wherein the image output unit and the image reader operate independently. However, *Hanamoto* does not overcome the deficiency of the rejection of claim 1 based on *Hirata*. Accordingly, claims 6-8 are also patentable over the combination of *Hirata* and *Hanamoto*.

Claim 10 defines an image forming apparatus that includes an image memory for storing image data acquired by an image reader and a mode memory for storing image forming conditions selected for the acquired image data. According to the apparatus of claim 10, an image data discarding controller discards image data of a job stopped by a job stopping controller while maintaining the image forming conditions. However, as set forth above, *Hirata* does not teach or suggest a mode memory for storing image forming conditions. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 10, and dependent claims 11-15.

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to enter the foregoing amendments and to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this response, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: December 2, 2003   By: *William C Rowland*

William C. Rowland
Registration No. 30,888

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620